UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,203	04/01/2004	Robert Lee Thompson	T0450.70038US00	7503

23628 7590 08/17/2009

WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210-2206

EXAMINER	
BLACKWELL, JAMES H	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/816,203	THOMPSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James H. Blackwell	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 July 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,14-16,49-114 and 166-168* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,14-16,49-114 and 166-168* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *01 April 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/28/2009 has been entered.

Claims 1, 14-16, 49-114 and 166-168 remain pending.

Claims 1, 49, 71 and 93 are independent Claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 14, 49-52, 54-57, 68-74, 76-79, 90-96, 98-101, 112-114 and 166-168 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrams et al. (hereinafter Abrams 1, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0122073 A1 filed 03/02/2001, published 09/05/2002) in view of Ricoh RDC-i700 Image Capture Device (hereinafter Ricoh, "Connecting to a Personal Computer Operation Manual,"

copyright 2000, Ricoh, archived 10/04/2003, 182 pages, downloaded from <"http://web.archive.org/*/http://www.ricohzome.com/support/manuals/PDF_MANUALS/i700/i700_Commecting_to_a_Personal_Computer.pdf">)

In regard to independent Claim 1, Abrams 1 discloses:

- *A method* (see Abstract; Page 1, Paragraphs [0001-0004]; Pages 3-4, Paragraphs [0031-0036]; Figure 5 → Abrams 1 describes various aspects of a web-based "telepresence" system that includes a HTML forms-based graphical user interface for the request, acquisition, storage, recall and management of still and/or video images of a remote location or scene) *comprising acts of:*
    - *a) providing an electronic document that includes a checklist comprising a plurality of items, each of which corresponds to a task, and at least one button associated with at least one of the plurality of items in the checklist* (at least Pages 4-5, Paragraphs [0033, 0036, 0042, 0045-0048]; Figure 5 → Figure 5 of Abrams 1 depicts an HTML form-based graphical user interface which includes a space (72) occupied by an HTML imagemap image of the remote location. Briefly, imagemaps are an HTML construct that contain at least one pre-defined sub-regions which are "active" in that, when selected (i.e. "clicked on"), perform a function (i.e. a *"task"*). In addition, Figure 5 also contains one or more thumbnail images which correspond to previous requests (i.e. causing the invocation of tasks) by a user for particular sub-regions. Each of these thumbnails is "clickable" which instructs the system to return a full-sized rendering of the

previously-acquired image. Specific to Abrams 1, each of the sub-regions correspond to a different part of the overall scene of the remote location portrayed in the imagemap. When the user clicks a particular sub-region, a command is sent to the server which commands the remote camera to capture an image of that sub-region). Thus, Figure 5 represents *"an electronic document"* (the HTML form), *"that includes a button"* (the "clickable" thumbnails correspond to at least "a button.").

Abrams_1 fails to explicitly disclose:

- *a checklist comprising a plurality of items, each of which corresponds to a task, and at least one button associated with at least one of the plurality of items in the checklist.*

However, Ricoh discloses an image capture device which can host a series of "Guide Lists" (see pages 98-126). Each "Guide List" is a checklist of images, listed by image title name (see page 98) to be acquired by the user of the camera as part of a photo shooting job. These lists are pre-defined either by a user on a PC or directly on the camera (see page 99). Specifically, Ricoh teaches "a checklist" (i.e. "guide list") comprising a plurality of items (i.e. titles of images to be acquired), each of which corresponds to a task (see pages 102-103 → step 6. select an image title to be recorded (essentially activating a button on the screen associated with the image title); step 6. record the image). Each of the image titles in the guide list is associated with a button on the screen that when chosen, places the camera in record mode from which

the user can then acquire the image. It also appears that image titles (i.e. buttons) can also be selected post-image capture which then displays to the user the captured image (see page 126, 2nd screen image showing title button and displayed image at right).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Abrams_1 and Ricoh as both inventions are related to the acquisition, storage and recall for display of images via the activation of buttons. Adding the disclosure of Ricoh provides the benefit of encompassing those buttons into a checklist that assures that each of the images in the checklist is acquired by the camera operator according to a schedule and sequence.

- *b) in response to selection of the at least one button, retrieving previously-stored data that represents at least one picture captured in connection with performance of the task corresponding to the at least one of the plurality of items, wherein the at least one picture has been previously associated with the electronic document; c) displaying the at least one picture* (at least Page 3 Paragraphs [0031-0036]; Page 5, Paragraphs [0041-0043, 0045]; Page 6, Paragraphs [0046-0054]; Figures 4-6 → Abrams 1 teaches that each of the thumbnail images, which correspond to previously-requested (and stored) images (data) of sub-regions can be selected (i.e. clicked on like a button) causing the system to retrieve the full-sized image for viewing, or as part of the construction of what Abrams

1 calls a "view card," which is a form of electronic postcard which can be emailed to others).

In regard to dependent Claim 14, Abrams 1 discloses:

- *the electronic document is a form* (at least Page 4, Paragraphs [0033, 0034]; Figure 5 → Figure 5 is an HTML form containing an imagemap, GUI controls for controlling various aspects of, for example, the remote camera, and one of more multiple thumbnails corresponding to previously-acquired/stored images).

In regard to independent Claim 49, Abrams 1 discloses:

- *A method* (see Abstract; Page 1, Paragraphs [0001-0004]; Pages 3-4, Paragraphs [0031-0036]; Figure 5 → Abrams 1 describes various aspects of a web-based "telepresence" system that includes a HTML forms-based graphical user interface for the request, acquisition, storage, recall and management of still and/or video images of a remote location or scene), *comprising the acts of:*
    - *(a) providing a first electronic document that includes* ***a checklist*** *comprising a plurality of items, each of which corresponds to a task and a first button at a first location in the document, wherein the first button is associated with at least one of the plurality of items in the checklist* (at least Pages 4-5, Paragraphs [0033, 0036, 0042, 0045-0048]; Figure 5 → Figure 5 of Abrams 1 depicts an HTML form-based graphical user interface page (i.e. *"a first electronic document"*) which includes a space

(70) (i.e. *"a first location"*) containing an imagemap image of the remote location, one or more controls, and thumbnails representing previously-acquired images. Briefly, imagemaps are an HTML construct that contain one or more pre-defined sub-regions which are "active" in that, when selected (i.e. clicked-on as in a *"first button"*), perform a function).

Abrams_1 fails to explicitly disclose:

- *a checklist comprising a plurality of items, each of which corresponds to a task and a first button at a first location in the document, wherein the first button is associated with at least one of the plurality of items in the checklist.*

However, Ricoh discloses an image capture device which can host a series of "Guide Lists" (see pages 98-126). Each "Guide List" is a checklist of images, listed by image title name (see page 98) to be acquired by the user of the camera as part of a photo shooting job. These lists are pre-defined either by a user on a PC or directly on the camera (see page 99). Specifically, Ricoh teaches *"a checklist"* (i.e. "guide list") *"comprising a plurality of items"* (i.e. titles of images to be acquired), *"each of which corresponds to a task"* (see pages 102-103 → step 6. select an image title to be recorded (essentially activating a *"first"* button on the screen associated with the image title); step 6. record the image). Each of the image titles in the guide list is associated with a button on the screen that when chosen, places the camera in record mode from which the user can then acquire the image. It also appears that

image titles (i.e. buttons) can also be selected post-image capture which then displays to the user the captured image (see page 126, 2nd screen image showing title button and displayed image at right).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Abrams_1 and Ricoh as both inventions are related to the acquisition, storage and recall for display of images via the activation of buttons. Adding the disclosure of Ricoh provides the benefit of encompassing those buttons into a checklist that assures that each of the images in the checklist is acquired by the camera operator according to a schedule and sequence.

- *(b) in response to selection of the first button, calling an image capture application to capture at least one image and to create data that represents the at least one image, wherein the at least one image relates to performance of the task corresponding to the at least one of the plurality of items in the checklist* (at least Pages 4-5, Paragraphs [0033, 0036, 0042, 0045-0048]; Figure 5 → Abrams 1 teaches that clicking on one of the sub-regions of the imagemap causes the system to command a camera to capture and store an image corresponding to the selected sub-region).

Abrams_1 fails to explicitly disclose:

- *wherein the at least one image relates to performance of the task corresponding to the at least one of the plurality of items in the checklist.*

However, Ricoh teaches (see page 126) selecting an image title (i.e. clicking a button) in the "guide list" (i.e. checklist) and causing the display of an image previously acquired (i.e. task which acquired the image) and associated with that image title (i.e. button).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Abrams_1 and Ricoh as both inventions are related to the acquisition, storage and recall for display of images via the activation of buttons. Adding the disclosure of Ricoh provides the benefit of encompassing those buttons into a checklist that assures that each of the images in the checklist is acquired by the camera operator according to a schedule and sequence and that images thus acquired can be recalled for display by the user by clicking its associated button corresponding to its image name.

- *(c) associating the data that represents the at least one image captured by the image capture application with the first location in the first electronic document so that the data that represents the at least one image is retrievable in response to selection of a second button at the first location in the first electronic document* (at least Pages 4-5, Paragraphs [0034-0039] → Abrams 1 teaches that images acquired as the result of a user selecting a sub-region (i.e. *"first button"*) of the imagemap are stored along with a "View Object" that contains the acquired images' attributes. Image data and its view object are then embedded as part of a server-updated

GUI and sent to the user. A thumbnail representation (i.e. *"second button"*) of the acquired image can then be selected from among other thumbnail images corresponding to other previously requested and acquired images to retrieve the full-sized version of the image, and presumably its attributes).

In regard to dependent Claim 50, Abrams 1 discloses:

- *the at least one image is a still image* (see Page 2, Paragraph [0022] → returned image can be a still image).

In regard to dependent Claim 51, Abrams 1 discloses:

- *the at least one image is a moving image* (see Page 2, Paragraph [0022] → returned image can be a video or *"moving"* image).

In regard to dependent Claim 52, Abrams 1 discloses:

- *the first electronic document is managed by a document editing application* (at least Page 4, Paragraphs [0033-0034] → first electronic document is a HTML-based document containing a Graphical User Interface *"managed"* by a web browser).
- *storing the at least one image at a second location provided to the image capture application by the document editing application* (at least Pages 4-5, Paragraphs [0033, 0036, 0042, 0045-0048]; Figure 5 → Abrams 1 teaches that clicking on

one of the sub-regions of the imagemap causes the system to command a camera to capture and store an image corresponding to the selected sub-region in a database on the server).

In regard to dependent Claim 54, Abrams 1 discloses:

- *the document editing application is a browser* (at least Page 4, Paragraphs [0033-0034] → first electronic document is a HTML-based document containing a Graphical User Interface which can be manipulated (e.g. *"edited"*) through a web browser).

In regard to dependent Claim 55, Abrams 1 discloses:

- *the second location is a file system location* (at least Page 5, Paragraph [00039] - → requested images are stored on an image server).

In regard to dependent Claim 56, Abrams 1 discloses:

- *the second location is a location in a database table* (at least Page 5, Paragraph [00039] → requested images can be stored on an image server in a database).

In regard to dependent Claim 57, Abrams 1 discloses:

- *the second location is a physical disk location* (at least Page 5, Paragraph [00039] → requested images can be stored on an image server in a database which is stored on a disk).

In regard to dependent Claim 68, Abrams 1 discloses:

- *the image capture application captures the at least one image using at least one image capture device* (see Figure 1 → depicts at least 1 image acquisition system using at least one image capture device).

In regard to dependent Claim 69, Abrams 1 discloses:

- *the at least one image capture device is a camera* (see Figure 1 → depicts at least 1 image acquisition system using at least one image capture device described as cameras).

In regard to dependent Claim 70, Abrams 1 fails to expressly disclose:

- *the at least one image capture device is a scanner*.

However, Abrams 1 does disclose remote access to digital still or video cameras which are controlled via a page-based user interface from a browser by clicking on one or more regions of an imagemap of a remote scene (see at least Pages 2-3, Paragraphs [0022-0025]). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have realized that both video and still cameras in this instance could provide similar functionality to that of a scanner in that both capture a snapshot of what is presented to them).

In regard to dependent Claim 166, Abrams 1 discloses:

- *the second button does not display any images representative of the at least one image* (at least Figure 5 → Figure 5 depicts a number of thumbnail images, one of which corresponds to a most recently requested and acquired image. The other thumbnails, which are also selectable (and therefore buttons), would correspond to other previously requested and acquired images. Thus, a user could select another of the "second buttons" and cause the display of other images that are not representative of an at least one most recent image).

In regard to Claims 71-74, 76-79, 90-92 and 167, Claims 71-74, 76-79, 90-92 and 167 merely recite a computer readable medium encoded with instructions, that when executed on a computer system, perform the method of Claims 49-52, 54-57, 68-70 and 166, respectively. Thus, Abrams 1 in view of Ricoh discloses every limitation of Claims 71-74, 76-79, 90-92 and 167, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 49-52, 54-57, 68-70 and 166.

In regard to Claims 93-96, 98-101, 112-114 and 168, Claims 93-96, 98-101, 112-114 and 168 merely recite a computer system for performing the method of Claims 49-52, 54-57, 68-70 and 166, respectively. Thus, Abrams 1 in view of Ricoh discloses every limitation of Claims 93-96, 98-101, 112-114 and 168, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 49-52, 54-57, 68-70 and 166.

Claims 15-16, 53, 58-60, 63-67, 75, 80-82, 85-89, 97, 102-104 and 107-111 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrams 1 in view of Ricoh, and in further view of Abrams et al. (hereinafter Abrams 2 U.S. Patent No. 6,625,812 filed 10/22/1999, issued 09/23/2003).

In regard to dependent Claim 15, Abrams 1 and Ricoh fail to expressly disclose:

- *the form includes entries relating to aircraft inspection*.

However, Abrams 2, which teaches other features related to Abrams 1 allows for the creation of "view cards" (Col. 2, lines 18-67; Col. 10, lines 33-67; Figures 3 & 7) comprising a preserved selected view and an image parameter set, which contains details about the image such as time taken, position, zoom factor etc. The user can also add comments (see Figure 7, item 84). These "view cards" can then be emailed to others.

Clearly, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have been able to apply the system taught by the combination of Abrams 1, Ricoh and Abrams 2 to fully document a previously acquired image, where the subject matter of the image could be anything, including those related to aircraft inspection.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Abrams 1, Ricoh and Abrams 2 as all three inventions generally relate to the acquisition of remote data using an HTML user interface with buttons and receiving data via the web (internet)). Adding the disclosure of Abrams 2 provides the benefit of allowing for the editing of captured images to add to documentation of the image.

In regard to dependent Claim 16, Abrams 1 and Ricoh fail to expressly disclose:

- *updating the form to include additional information*.

However, Abrams 2, which teaches other features related to Abrams 1, allows for the creation of "view cards" (Col. 2, lines 18-67; Col. 10, lines 33-67; Figures 3 & 7) comprising a preserved selected view and an image parameter set, which contains details about the image such as time taken, position, zoom factor etc. The user can also add comments (see Figure 7, item 84). These "view cards" can then be emailed to others.

Clearly, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have been able to apply the system taught by the combination of Abrams 1, Ricoh and Abrams 2 to fully document a previously acquired image, where the subject matter of the image could be anything, including those related to aircraft inspection.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Abrams 1, Ricoh and Abrams 2 as all three inventions generally relate to the acquisition of remote data using an HTML user interface with buttons and receiving data via the web (internet)). Adding the disclosure of Abrams 2 provides the benefit of allowing for the editing of captured images to add to documentation of the image.

In regard to dependent Claim 53, Abrams 1 and Ricoh fail to expressly disclose:

- *the document editing application is a word processing application.*

However, Abrams 2 discloses *the document editing application is a word processing application* (at least Col. 2, lines 18-67 → allows a user to control and capture remote images from cameras and also allows the user to construct (and edit) "View Cards" or annotated snapshots of remotely captured scenes that can contain comments and allows the user to email these cards to others. The editing features available to the user are not unlike those that could be carried out by an editor (e.g., word processor)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Abrams 1, Ricoh and Abrams 2 as all three inventions relate to different aspects of the acquisition of remote data using an HTML user interface with buttons and receiving data via the web (internet)). Adding the disclosure of Abrams 2 provides the benefit of allowing for the editing of captured images to add to documentation of the image).

In regard to dependent Claim 58, Abrams 1 and Ricoh fail to expressly disclose:

- *copying at least some of the first electronic document to create a second electronic document; and storing the second electronic document.*

Abrams 1 provides a "first electronic document" in the form of a page-based user interface (i.e. an HTML form). Image requests received by the server are processed and a new page-based user interface is produced to include a reference (a

thumbnail) to the requested image. It is unclear however, whether any portion of the "first electronic document" is copied to create "a second electronic document."

However, Abrams 2 discloses *copying at least some of the first electronic document to create a second electronic document; and storing the second electronic document* (at least Col. 2, lines 43-67; Col. 10, line 6 through Col. 11, line 17; Figures 3 and 7 → Abrams 2 provides to the user a page-based user interface similar in look and function to that of Abrams 1. However, Abrams 2 teaches the creation of a "View Card" which is a form of electronic postcard (see Figures 3 & 7). Here, Figure 3 would correspond to a "first electronic document." A user requests an image by clicking on an imagemap of a remote scene (72) contained in the page-based user interface (the "first electronic document"). The user can then choose to "preserve the view" corresponding to the currently viewed image (presumably the requested image). To do this, the user requests to create a "View Card." The View Card corresponds to the "second electronic document" and contains components from the "first electronic document," namely the requested image. This "View Card" can then be stored into a view card database and can also be emailed to others).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Abrams 1, Ricoh and Abrams 2 as all three inventions generally relate to the acquisition of remote data using an HTML user interface with buttons and receiving data via the web (internet)). Adding the disclosure of Abrams 2 provides the benefit of preserving a portion of the original document into a second to be shared with and used by others.

In regard to dependent Claim 59, Abrams 1 and Ricoh fail to expressly disclose:

- *the act of storing the second electronic document further comprises an act of storing the second electronic document without storing the first electronic document.*

However, Abrams 2 discloses *the act of storing the second electronic document further comprises an act of storing the second electronic document without storing the first electronic document* (at least Col. 2, lines 43-67; Col. 10, line 6 through Col. 11, line 17; Figures 3 and 7 → Abrams 2 allows a user to "preserve a view" from a first electronic document into a second electronic document (i.e. a "View Card") which can be stored. The first electronic document however is not stored.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Abrams 1, Ricoh and Abrams 2 as all three inventions generally relate to the acquisition of remote data using an HTML user interface with buttons and receiving data via the web (internet)). Adding the disclosure of Abrams 2 provides the benefit of preserving a portion of the original document to document a particular instant of time to be used by others.

In regard to dependent Claim 60, Abrams 1 discloses:

Note: for purposes of examination, the Examiner assumes that this claim describes the point where a user has submitted their request for an image by clicking a first button in a first location and receives from the system an updated or "second electronic document" containing both the first button in a first location and a second button in

another or "third" location. In other words, there are two buttons in two locations, the second of which is operable to retrieve the requested image.

Applicants are advised that if this is not the proper interpretation, please provide further explanation so that this claim may be interpreted properly.

- *the button is a first button and wherein the method further comprises acts of:*
    - *retrieving the second electronic document* (at least Pages 3-4, Paragraphs [0028-0032]; Figure 5 → in response to a user requesting a particular sub-image from the imagemap at a *"first location"* (72) by clicking on it ("first button"), the system acquires the requested image and performs an update to the GUI page to include a "clickable" (i.e. *"second button"*) thumbnail reference to the requested image in another (i.e. *"third"*) location (76) on the page)*; and*
    - *in response to selection of a second button at a third location in the second electronic document, retrieving the at least one image* (at least Page 4, Paragraph [0036]; Figure 5 → a user can select or click on the thumbnail image ("second button") and retrieve the requested image).

In regard to dependent Claim 63, Abrams 1 discloses:

- *displaying the at least one image* (at least Page 4, Paragraph [0036]; Figure 5 → the user can select the thumbnail and retrieve the full-sized version of the image for display).

In regard to dependent Claim 64, Abrams 1 and Ricoh fail to expressly disclose:

- *the first electronic document is a template for the second electronic document.*

However, Abrams 2 discloses *the first electronic document is a template for the second electronic document* (at least Col. 2, lines 43-67; Col. 10, line 6 through Col. 11, line 17; Figures 3 and 7 → a user views a page-based user interface that shows him a live view of a remote physical location. From this "live view selection page" the user can control a camera at the remote location simply by clicking on the presented image or by using other controls on the page. In this manner, the user visually navigates the remote space (panning, zooming, etc.) and selects various live views. The live view selection page allows the user to preserve any live view. To communicate a preserved view to another user, the user clicks the "Create View Card" button. A view card construction page appears and the user enters the recipient's email address and a message about the preserved view. To communicate the view card to the designated recipient, the user clicks "Send View Card." The recipient, when viewing the page-based view card, sees the preserved live view, the message from the other user, and the communication information. Thus, the “View Card” is derived from the original view page, so the original view page is a template for the “View Card” where the original view page is the first electronic document and the “View Card” is the second electronic document).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Abrams 1, Ricoh and Abrams 2 as all three inventions generally relate to the acquisition of remote data using an HTML user

interface with buttons and receiving data via the web (internet)). Adding the disclosure of Abrams 2 provides the benefit of preserving a portion of the original document to document a particular instant of time to be used by others.

In regard to dependent Claim 65, Abrams 1 and Ricoh fail to expressly disclose:

- *the second electronic document is not modifiable.*

However, Abrams 2 discloses *the second electronic document is not modifiable* (at least Col. 2, lines 43-67; Col. 10, line 6 through Col. 11, line 17; Figures 3 and 7 → the "View Card" sent to a recipient is akin to an electronic postcard of what he sees to another user. Moreover, the view card recipient through the view card can seamlessly connect to the live remote source and visually navigate the space himself. The view card itself, which is intended to capture a moment in time and document it in image and comments, would likely not be edited by the recipient of the view card).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Abrams 1, Ricoh and Abrams 2 as all three inventions generally relate to the acquisition of remote data using an HTML user interface with buttons and receiving data via the web (internet)). Adding the disclosure of Abrams 2 provides the benefit of preserving a portion of the original document to document a particular instant of time to be used by others.

In regard to dependent Claim 66, Abrams 1 and Ricoh fail to expressly disclose:

- *the first and second electronic documents are forms.*

Abrams 1 generally teaches the use of HTML-based forms for their Graphical User Interface based on templates that are updated as requests for images are made and submitted to a server.

However, Abrams 2 discloses *the first and second electronic documents are forms* (at least Figures 3 & 7 → Figure 3 depicts the original electronic document for viewing a particular view and manipulating the view preparing to capture a particular instant of the image into a "View Card", which is depicted in Figure 7. Both of these documents can be HTML documents. Both contain features one might expect to be present in a typical HTML form).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Abrams 1, Ricoh and Abrams 2 as all three inventions generally relate to the acquisition of remote data using an HTML user interface with buttons and receiving data via the web (internet)). Adding the disclosure of Abrams 2 provides the benefit of providing HTML forms as a part of the user interface.

In regard to dependent Claim 67, Abrams 1 and Ricoh fail to expressly disclose:

- *the first and second electronic documents are forms including entries related to aircraft inspection.*

However, Abrams 2, which teaches other features related to Abrams 1 allows for the creation of "View Cards" (Col. 2, lines 18-67; Col. 10, lines 33-67; Figures 3 & 7) comprising a "preserved view" from a "first electronic document" and an image parameter set, which contains details about the image such as time taken, position, zoom factor etc. The user can also add comments (see Figure 7, item 84). Both the "first and second electronic documents" can comprise HTML form components. The "View Cards" can be stored and emailed to others.

Clearly, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have been able to apply the system taught by the combination of Abrams 1, Ricoh and Abrams 2 to fully document a previously acquired image, where the subject matter of the image could be anything, including those related to aircraft inspection.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Abrams 1, Ricoh and Abrams 2 as all three inventions generally relate to the acquisition of remote data using an HTML user interface with buttons and receiving data via the web (internet)). Adding the disclosure of Abrams 2 provides the benefit of allowing for the editing of captured images to add to documentation of the image.

In regard to Claims 75, 80-82 and 85-89, Claims 75, 80-82 and 85-89 merely recite a computer readable medium encoded with instructions, that when executed on a computer system, perform the method of Claims 53, 58-60 and 63-67, respectively. Thus, the combination of Abrams 1, Ricoh and Abrams 2 discloses every limitation of Claims 75, 80-82 and 85-89, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 53, 58-60 and 63-67.

In regard to Claims 97, 102-104 and 107-111, Claims 97, 102-104 and 107-111 merely recite a computer system for performing the method of Claims 53, 58-60 and 63-67, respectively. Thus, the combination of Abrams 1, Ricoh and Abrams 2 discloses every limitation of Claims 97, 102-104 and 107-111, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 53, 58-60 and 63-67.

Claims 61-62, 83-84 and 105-106 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrams 1 in view of Ricoh, and in further view of Abrams 2, and in further view of Kaplan et al. (hereinafter Kaplan, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0056434 filed 03/29/2001, published 12/17/2001).

In regard to dependent Claim 61, Abrams 1, Ricoh and Abrams 2 fail to disclose:

- *the act of retrieving the at least one image further comprises an act of: determining if the at least one image exists at the second location.*

However, Kaplan discloses *the act of retrieving the at least one image further comprises an act of: determining if the at least one image exists at the second*

location (at least Page 6, Paragraphs [0058-0059] → typical operating systems that when downloading digital media first make certain that an existing image is not present (e.g., checks the name of the file currently stored) and repeatedly prompts the user if they desire to overwrite a preexisting file. Kaplan further discloses that such images can be acquired using scanning techniques ([0058])).

Thus, for systems where images are digitized via scanners and scanning techniques, the operating system of Kaplan would first check, then prompt the user that they are about to overwrite an existing stored image.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Abrams 1, Ricoh, Abrams 2 and Kaplan as all of these inventions generally relate to the acquisition of remote data. Adding the disclosure of Kaplan provides the benefit of providing a warning before overwriting an existing image.

In regard to dependent Claim 62, Abrams 1, Ricoh and Abrams 2 fail to disclose:

- *when the at least one image exists at the second location, retrieving the at least one image from the second location.*

However, Kaplan discloses *when the at least one image exists at the second location, retrieving the at least one image from the second location* (at least Page 6, Paragraphs [0058-0059] → typical operating systems that when downloading digital media first make certain that an existing image is not present (e.g., checks the name of the file currently stored) and repeatedly prompts the user if they desire to

overwrite a preexisting file. Kaplan further discloses that such images can be acquired using scanning techniques ([0058])).

Thus, for systems where images are digitized via scanners and scanning techniques, the operating system of Kaplan would first check, then prompt the user that they are about to overwrite an existing stored image. If that is okay with the user, the image is overwritten and the new image is stored and can be subsequently retrieved.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Abrams 1, Ricoh, Abrams 2 and Kaplan as all of these inventions generally relate to the acquisition of remote data. Adding the disclosure of Kaplan provides the benefit of providing a warning before overwriting an existing image.

In regard to Claims 83-84, Claims 83-84 merely recite a computer readable medium encoded with instructions, that when executed on a computer system, perform the method of Claims 61-62 respectively. Thus, the combination of Abrams 1, Ricoh, Abrams 2 and Kaplan discloses every limitation of Claims 83-84, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 61-62.

In regard to Claims 105-106, Claims 105-106 merely recite a computer system for performing the method of Claims 61-62, respectively. Thus, the combination of Abrams

1, Ricoh, Abrams 2 and Kaplan discloses every limitation of Claims 105-106, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 61-62.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 14-16, 49-114 and 166-168 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H. Blackwell whose telephone number is (571)272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/James H. Blackwell/
08/11/2009

/DOUG HUTTON/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2176